REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated June 25, 2007.

Claims 1-11 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging review and consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 1, 2007.

Rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Novakov (6,571,103), in view of Fonseca (2004/0033778). Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action acknowledges (Office Action, page 3) that Novakov does not disclose a radio base station with means for receiving and discriminating broadcast packets traveling over the communication line addressed to the radio mobile terminal operating in the power-saving mode and, when a broadcast packet concerning a physical address inquiry is found among the broadcast packets traveling over the communication line addressed to the radio mobile terminal, responding to the broadcast packet as an agent for the radio mobile terminal to solve the physical address inquiry. However, the Office Action avers that Fonseca discloses or suggests such features.

Fonseca discloses a method and an apparatus for relaying information in an ad-hoc network to minimize battery consumption of mobile units utilized for relay purposes (Fonseca, Abstract). Fonseca discloses that when a mobile unit 102 located in an out-of-reach area 103 is unable to communicate directly with a base station 106, an ad-hoc network utilizing remote mobile units is set up to communicate with the mobile unit 102 (Fonseca, page 1, par. 3; Fig. 1); when the remote mobile unit 400 is finished with its inquiry of neighboring mobiles, the inquiring mobile 400 will have identified a list of neighbor devices the mobile can serve as relay devices to the ad-hoc interface, which mobile devices then become relay candidates (Fonseca, page 3, par. 50). In order to conserve battery power, Fonseca discloses that for purposes of the relay operation those mobile units that are actively transmitting are favored over inactive units or that those mobile units using real-time services are favored over active units not using real-time services (Fonseca,

page 1, par. 10), and while a remote unit 400 is acting as a relay, it continuously receives transmissions 409 from another remote unit utilizing the ad-hoc air interface and relays these transmissions (Fonseca, page 3, par. 49).

Fonseca does not disclose or suggest that any device acts as a proxy for a target mobile to receive and discriminate broadcast packets traveling over a communications line addressed to the target mobile, and then responds to the broadcast packet as an agent for the target mobile terminal. As discussed, Fonseca is drawn to assembling a power-efficient relay network made of mobile terminals in order to reach a target cellular 102 located in the out of coverage area. Accordingly, Fonseca does not disclose or suggest any of the terminals acting as an agent and responding for the radio mobile terminal, as required by claims 1, 5, 8 and 9.

Stated differently, according to an aspect of applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1, 5, 8 and 9, the radio mobile terminal which is in a power save mode is insulated from having to respond and to solve the physical address inquiry because the base station acts as an agent therefor. Fonseca on the other hand by establishing an ad-hoc relay network of mobile terminals will result in the out-of-coverage area mobile unit 102 to be in touch with and react to the relayed signal.

Further, Fonseca does not disclose or suggest any of the mobile terminals acting as a agent for responding to a broadcast packet received to solve the physical address inquiry addressed to the target radio mobile terminal, as further required by claims 1, 5, 8 and 9. There is no disclosure or suggestion of packet receiving and discrimination at all in Fonseca. Moreover, Fonseca does not disclose a base station for performing any of the receiving and responding services as an agent for the target radio mobile terminal, as also required by claims 1, 5, 8 and 9. As discussed previously, an effect and advantage of an aspect of the present invention is that the battery charge of mobile units is conserved by the base station performing the aforementioned service. Accordingly, Fonseca and Novakov even taken together in combination do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claims 1, 5, 8 and 9.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, claims 6-7 depend from claim 5, and claims 10-11 depend from claim 9. Therefore, claims 2-4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant notes that a number of Office Actions have already been issued in the course of the present application. Therefore applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue an allowance or provide the best available art in the next Office correspondence.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims and pass this case to issue.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present Response or regarding the application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-provided telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING SYSTEM ON SEPTEMBER 18, 2007

MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700